

IAP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 22 MAR 2006

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 in written format
 in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/010639

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N) Yes: Claims 3,4,8,9
 No: Claims 1,2,5-7

Inventive step (IS) Yes: Claims
 No: Claims 1-9

Industrial applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-9
 No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1.1. The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1 : GB 2 361 118 A (RESPONSIVELOAD LTD) 10 October 2001 (2001-10-10)

1.2. The present application does not meet the requirements of Articles 33(2) and (3) PCT since claims 1, 2 and 5-7 lack novelty and claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 lack inventive step.

OBJECTIONS ON NOVELTY

2.1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a responsive load device adapted to be connected to an electric load (abstract and accompanying figure), with the technical features of independent apparatus claim 1. The document discloses as well the subject-matter of claims 2 and 5 (figure 4 and claim 3 of D1).

2.2. Same applies "mutatis mutandis" to independent method claim 6, and dependent claim 7.

2.3. Therefore, the subject-matter of claims 1, 2 and 5-7 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

INVENTIVE STEP OBJECTIONS

3.1. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-9 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

3.2. Dependent apparatus claims 3 and 4 and dependent method claims 8 and 9 present disconnecting the load, or increasing its consumption to a maximum to

compensate the level stress in the two opposite senses of deviation, when the stress falls out of the range limited by further upper and lower thresholds. However, this compensating action can be derived from D1, figure 3, where the controlled load will be operated like this, in combination with another sensed magnitude. The difference between these claims and the device/method in D1 will be this simplification. Apart from the obviously and consequently simpler design of the responsive load controller the only result of the omission of the consideration of a second variable is that the effects related to this are no longer present in the controller. Such a simplification does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY

4.1. The industrial applicability of the invention is out of doubt.